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**Introduction**

Relative clauses in English have been extensively studied (see, for instance, Biber et al., 1999: 195, 602-638; Downing and Locke, 2006: 446-452; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1033-1096; Quirk et al., 1999: 1239-1275), among other reasons, because of the wide range of structural and functional capabilities they display. However, although there exist specific studies that have explored relative clauses such as Alexiadou et al., (2000), Hendery (2012) or Kidd (2011), to mention but a few, very few have focused on *wh*-relatives from a contrastive perspective (Brandt et al., 2008: 325-347; Whitley, 2002).

In this study I will investigate *wh*-relatives in English, Spanish and German, paying particular attention to the prepositional type, which has so far been relatively underexplored. Taking English *wh*-relatives as *tertium comparationis* (Kidd, 2011) and using a corpus-based methodology, this paper will describe whatever parallelisms and divergences emerge when comparing these constructions with their equivalents in Spanish (Bosque et al., 1999: 395-522; Mackenzie and Martínez Caro, 2012) and German (Lehmann, 1984; Krenn & Volk, 1993).

I have decided to compare and contrast *wh*-relatives in English, Spanish and German because, despite having a common source as Indo-European languages, they belong to different families: English and German are Germanic languages, whereas Spanish is a Romance language. In addition, I also have a personal motivation to explore these languages. Doing a degree in English Language and Literature, with a minor in German, has picked my interest in these three languages. This paper will help me know more about them as regards the object of analysis.

Part 1 presents an overview of *wh*-relative clauses in English, Spanish and German, offering a revision of the relevant theoretical notions. The first chapter begins with the explanation of relatives as subordinate clauses and their corresponding types. Section 1.1 offers an introductory description of the relationship maintained between relative markers and their corresponding antecedents. In section 1.2 a distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses is provided. Section 1.3, in turn, focuses on the relation maintained between relative pronoun and their antecedents in English (Section
1.3.1), Spanish (Section 1.3.2.) and German (Section 1.3.3.). The second chapter concentrates on prepositional *wh*-relatives, paying special attention to the relative pronoun *whom* (and their Spanish and German equivalents), as they are generally considered to be difficult for Spanish EFL students (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 626; Brucart, 1999: 473).

Part 2, on the other hand, offers an empirical analysis based on the tokens of *wh*-relative clauses found in my corpus. Chapter 3 provides a description of the corpus on which this investigation is based: the *Simon Fraser University review corpus* (SFURC). The SFURC consists of 400 written reviews extracted from the platform Epinions.com in 2004, where people gave their opinions about movies and books in an informal style (Section 3.1.). Section 3.2. presents a set of nine research questions, that will be pursued in this study, whereas Section 3.3. explains the process of data extraction and the parameters of analysis. Finally, chapter 4 focuses on the discussion of findings, which is followed by a summary of the major findings and the conclusions to be drawn from this investigation, offering suggestions for further research.
Part I Review and Conceptual Framework

1. Wh-relative clauses and their Spanish and German equivalents: An overview

A relative clause is a special kind of subordinate clause whose primary function is as modifier to a noun or nominal (Biber et al., 1999: 604; Huddleston & Pullum, 2005: 183; Downing and Locke, 2006: 447). It generally functions as a Postmodifier in an NG, serving to expand the meaning and specify the reference of the Head noun, which is called its antecedent (Biber et al., 1999: 195; Downing and Locke, 2006: 449; Gómez González, 2016; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1034; Quirk et al., 1985: 1245), head noun (Kidd, 2011: 15) or correlative element (Alexiadou et al., 2000: 54) as in (1).

(1) a. The film which I needed is unobtainable (Huddleston & Pullum, 2005: 183)
   b. ‘La película que necesitaba es inasequible’
   c. ‘Der Film, den ich brauchte, ist unerreichbar’

As can be seen in (1a), (1b) and (1c) relative clauses in English, Spanish and German are introduced by a relative word, also known as relativiser, which can be a pronoun, a determiner or an adverb, and which can have a connective function and a specific syntactic function in the sub-clause or in a group or phrase within the sub-clause (Alexiadou et al., 2000: 50; Biber et al., 1999: 608; Bosque et al., 1999: 398; Downing and Locke, 2006: 449; Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013: 164; Kidd, 2011: 16; Lehmann, 1984: 44; Quirk et al., 1985: 1246; Real Academia Española, 2011: 243).

Relative clauses have been analysed resorting to relational and/or formal criteria, which are relevant in terms of language processing, typology and function (Kidd 2011; Gómez González 2016). From a relational point of view, four types of relative clauses may be distinguished –illustrated in (2)– according to the relation maintained between the relative subclause and the larger construction containing it (Alexiadou et al., 2000: 2; Gómez González 2006, Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1034): restrictive or integrated relative –in (2a)–, non-restrictive or supplementary relative –in (2b)–, supplementary cleft relative –in (2c)– and fused relative –in (2d)–.
The integrated relative clause (Downing and Locke, 2006: 446; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1034-1035); Huddleston & Pullum, 2005: 187) is the most central and most frequent type of relative construction. It usually functions as a modifier within a nominal constituent as in (2a), for example, where who defaced the statue modifies boys, which is the antecedent for the pronoun who. Integrated relative clauses are so called because they are integrated into the construction containing them, both prosodically and in terms of their informational content. The prototypical integrated relative serves to restrict the denotation of the head nominal it modifies, and is often referred to by the term ‘restrictive relative’ or ‘defining relative’. (Biber et al., 1999: 602; Kidd, 2011: 84,142,151; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1034-1035; Quirk et al., 1985: 1239).

A supplementary relative clause, on the other hand, adds extra information about the antecedent. The information is not fully integrated into the structure of the containing clause and not needed to delimit the set denoted by the antecedent (Downing and Locke, 2006: 446, 451; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1035). For example, in (2b), the antecedent of who is not the nominal father, but the NP my father, which refers to a unique person: the clause who retired last year thus plays no role in identifying the referent, but adds further information about him. Both integrated and supplementary relative clauses are dealt with in section 1.1.

Now, turning to it-cleft construction, the fore-grounded element (underlined in (3)) is called a cleft relative clause.
(3)  
  a. Kim wanted Pat as a treasurer [non-cleft]
  
  b. It was Kim who wanted Pat as a treasurer [cleft]
  
  c. It was Pat that Kim wanted as a treasurer [cleft]
  
  (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1035)

Considering the above examples, (3a) is an ordinary, non-cleft, clause, while (3b) and (3c) are its cleft counterparts. The underlined clauses are the cleft relatives, differing in function and, in certain respects, their internal structure from integrated relatives. Cleft constructions are described as a special kind of *identificational-specifying constructions* in that they divide the more elementary construction into two parts, one of which is fore-grounded and the other back-grounded. In (3b) *Kim* is fore-grounded, and *who wanted Pat as a treasurer* back-grounded, whereas in (3c) the fore-grounded element is *Pat*, and the back-grounded element is *that Kim wanted as treasurer* (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 155; Downing and Locke, 2006: 249-252; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1035; Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 89).

Lastly, fused relatives are the most complex of the four relative constructions from a syntactic point of view. While in the other three types the relative pronoun can be separated from its antecedent, this is not possible in the case of fused relatives, illustrated in (2d) above and (4b) below.

(4)  
  a. It would mean abandoning that which we hold most dear [antecedent+clause]
  
  b. It would mean abandoning what we hold most dear [fused relative]
  
  (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1035)

In (4a) its antecedent, *that*, is post-modified by *which we hold most dear*, an integrated relative clause, but in (4b), *what* corresponds to *that* and *which* combined, so that it is not possible to separately identify antecedent and relative clause- hence the term ‘fused’ (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 583; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1035) or ‘nominal’ (Downing and Locke, 2006: 100-101; Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1246).
Turning now to formal criteria, the type of the verb present in the relative clause, has also been used to differentiate finite relative clauses from non-finite relative clauses, as shown in (5) (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1173). Relative clauses tend to be finite, with a tensed verb in a past or present form (or irrealis were), but they may also have a non-finite infinitival, present or past participial verbal form, in which case we speak about infinitival, gerund-participial, and past-participial relative clauses illustrated in (6a), (6b) and (6c) extracted from Huddleston & Pullum, (2002: 1173), respectively (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 604; Downing and Locke, 2006: 448; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1173; Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1239).

(5)  

a. The pictures *which Jane took yesterday*   [finite relative ]  

   b. The best person *to write such a book*     [non-finite relative ]

(6)  

a. The book *to be written by Jane*             (infinitive) [infinitival form]

   b. The book being written by Jane (ing-)  [gerund-participial form]

   c. The book *written by Jane*   (ed-)            [past-participial form]

An additional criterion is to classify relative clauses according to the whether or not they contain one of the special relative words or relativisers such as *who, which*, etc., or *that*, or simply a *gap*, i.e. a missing constituent. Relative clauses are so called because they are related by their form to an antecedent. They contain within their structure an anaphoric element whose interpretation is determined by the antecedent. This anaphoric element may be overt or covert. In the overt case the relative clause is marked by the presence of one of the relative words *who, whom, whose, which*, etc., as or within the initial constituent: clauses of this type we call *wh*-relative clauses. The class of non-*wh* relatives is subdivided into *that* relatives and bare relatives depending on the presence or absence of *that*, respectively, as shown in (7).

---

1 Examples (5) and (6) have been extracted from Gómez González, M. A. G. 2016. Syntax and Semantics Class Notes: Relative clauses. Unpublished manuscript.
(7)  a. *Wh*- relative: The film *which* I needed is not obtainable

b.  Non- *wh* relative:

b.1. *That* relative: The film *that* I needed is not obtainable

b.2  Bare relative: The film (Ø) I needed is not obtainable (Huddleston & Pullum, 2005: 184)

In what follows corresponding sections are devoted to characterize in more detail: (i) the relation between the relative pronoun and its antecedent (Section 1.1), (ii) restrictive versus non-restrictive relative clauses (Section 1.2), and (iii) the differences and similarities that emerge when contrasting *wh*-relatives in English, Spanish and German (Section 1.3).

1.1. Relative markers and their antecedents

Part of the importance of relative clauses lies in the specifying power of the relative form. The *relative form*, also known as *relative pronoun* or *relative adverb*, shows concord with its antecedent, to which it anaphorically refers. Furthermore, it indicates its function within the relative clause either as an element of clause structure (S, OD, C, A), or as a constituent of an element in the relative clause. (Biber et al., 1999: 608; Quirk et al., 1999: 1245). The *antecedent* (Biber et al., 1999: 195; Downing and Locke, 2006: 449; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1034; Quirk et al., 1985: 1245), which is the constituent of the matrix clause that is post-modified by the relative clause, is also called the *head noun* (Kidd, 2011: 15), or *correlative element* (Alexiadou et al., 2000: 54). The former label emphasises the licensing role of that constituent in the relative construction while the latter stresses the postposition of the relative element with respect to the noun it modifies. The relationship maintained between the relative clause and its antecedent is the basis of all relative constructions and the first feature that should be analyzed. As illustrations, let us consider (8) and (9):

(8) A 1953 subversive art teacher from UCLA *who* goes to the east coast to teach a group of overachieving students to find alternatives to marriage.
(9)  *Walter, who is on the naughty list,* is a ruthless publisher by day and an inattentive father to Michael (Daniel Tay) and husband to Emily (Mary Steenburgen) by night.  

Focusing on the concept of the antecedent, in the example (8) two parts can be differentiated: the relative element is usually fronted at the beginning of the dependent clause, and the correlative element may also be fronted in the main clause.

In (8) the antecedent (in italics), *A 1953 subversive art teacher from UCLA,* is post-modified by a restrictive relative clause headed (underlined), headed by *who* (in bold type), *who is on the naughty list,* thereby helping us to identify the referent of the antecedent that is referred to by the relative pronoun. In (9) the antecedent, *Walter,* is post-modified by the non-restrictive *who*-headed relative clause, which provides additional information (*who is on the naughty list*) about the antecedent. These and the aforementioned examples show that relative constructions require the presence of an antecedent to interpret the reference of the relative form. This is an anaphoric element that may be overt or covert. In the overt case the relative clause is marked by the presence of one of the relative words *who, whom, whose, which,* etc., as or within the initial constituent. Clauses of this type are known as *wh*-relatives. In non-*wh* relatives the anaphoric element, in contrast, is covert. This class can be subdivided into *that* relatives and bare relatives depending on the presence or absence of *that.* (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002:1034, 1047).

1.2. Restrictive versus non-restrictive relative clauses

In English, Spanish and German relative clauses may be restrictive or non-restrictive relative clauses (Kidd, 2011: 84, 142, 151; Lehmann, 1984: 183-186; Real Academia Española, 2011: 242-245). As already noted, the former, also described as *defining* (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 602; Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1239) or *integrated* (Bosque *et al.*, 1999: 408; Downing and Locke, 2006: 446) ; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1034; Huddleston & Pullum, 2005: 187; Krenn & Volk, 1993: see Resources; Lehmann,1984: 183-184) are used to restrict the reference of the Head noun they modify. This type of clauses is
not separated from the preceding NG by commas, and as a result, they are always integrated or embedded, as shown from (10) to (12).

(10)  A 1953 subversive art teacher from UCLA who goes to the east coast to teach a group of overachieving students to find alternatives to marriage <SFURC:En no1.txt> 2

(11) Entre todos convencen a los malvados que ayudaban a Encantador para que se vuelvan buenos y los dejen libres <SFURC:Sp no_2_8.txt>

‘Among all they convince the evil ones who helped Prince Charming to become good and leave them free’

(12) Dass er nun unbedingt eine Frau sucht, die Nacht mit ihm verbringt <SFURC:Gm ja_1_5.txt>

‘That he is now urgently looking for a woman who spends the night with him’

The relative pronoun who in example (10) identifies the person that performs the action. From all possible teachers from UCLA, it is only the one who goes to the East Coast. Furthermore, the relative pronoun is not separated from the preceding NG (a subversive art teacher from UCLA). In (11) the Spanish relative pronoun que in example identifies the person that performs the action. From all possible evil characters in the film, they are only the ones who helped Prince Charming. The relative pronoun is not separated by commas from the preceding NG los malvados. And in (12) the German relative pronoun die in example (12) identifies the person that performs the action. From all possible women, he is looking for one who spends the night with him. The relative pronoun in this case is separated by commas from the preceding NG eine Frau. This is an exceptional case as German relative clauses always appear between commas.

On the other hand, non-restrictive relative clauses, also known as non-defining relatives (Biber et al., 1999: 602; Bosque et al., 1999: 408; Quirk et al., 1985: 1240) or appositive clauses (Alexiadou et al., 2000: 30; Kidd, 2011: 84; Lehmann, 1984: 184), provide further information about the preceding NG, but this information is not

2 Unless otherwise specified all examples are extracted from my corpus.
necessary to identify the reference expressed by the Head noun they post-modify. Unlike the restrictive type, non-restrictive relatives are separated from the NG they post-modify by commas in supplementive constructs (Downing and Locke, 2006: 446, 451; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1035), as in (13) to (15).

(13) Walter, who is on the naughty list, is a ruthless publisher by day and an inattentive father to Michael (Daniel Tay) and husband to Emily (Mary Steenburger) by night <SFURC: En no5.txt>

(14) Se convirtió en personaje famoso gracias a la serie Mr. Bean (1989), la cual fue llevada a la gran pantalla con el título Bean, the ultimate disaster movie (1997) <SFURC: En yes_4_19.txt>

“He became a famous character thanks to the TV series Mr. Bean (1989), which was brought to the big screen entitled Bean, the ultimate disaster movie (1997)”

(15) Dazu der Coen typische subtile Humor, die Extravaganten Charaktere und nicht zuletzt eine logische Story, die mit Schauspielern kongenial umgesetzt wurde <SFURC: Gm ja_5_5.txt>

‘Ignoring the Coen’s typical ingenious humor, the extravagant characters and finally an illogical story, which has been mildly implemented due to the actors’.

In (13), the relative pronoun who is separated from the NG by commas. The reference of the head noun has already been identified, the function of the relative pronoun is to provide further and additional information about the antecedent: ‘Walter, who by the way is on the naughty list’.

In example (14), the Spanish relative pronoun el cual is separated from the NG by a comma. The reference of the head noun has already been identified, the function of this relative pronoun is to provide additional information about the antecedent. ‘The TV series entitled Mr. Bean, which by the way was brought to the big screen’.
In the final example, the German relative pronoun *die* is separated from the NG by commas. The reference of the head noun has already been identified, the function of this relative pronoun *die* is to provide further information about its antecedent. The story directed by Coen, which by the way has been mildly implemented due to the actors of the film.

1.3. *Wh*-relative constructions and their Spanish and German equivalents

This section focuses on English *wh*-relative constructions and their Spanish and English equivalents in order to narrow down the research and to be able to shed light upon this area which, to my knowledge, has not yet been tackled from an English-Spanish-German contrastive perspective. Furthermore, as the label *wh*-relatives is used as a cover-term to refer to several relative markers in English, the scope of our study is further limited to relative constructions headed by *who, which, whom* and *whose* and to their Spanish and German equivalents. First, attention is centered on English (Section 1.2.2.1.) to provide a *tertium comparationis* for the comparison and contrast with their Spanish and German equivalents (Sections 1.2.2.2. and 1.2.2.3., respectively).

1.3.1 English *wh*-relative markers

In English *wh*-relative markers can be classified according to the following parameters: (i) *gender or animacy*, (ii) *gender and number*, (iii) *case*, (iv) *syntax* and (v) *context or speech*. (Biber et al., 1999: 612- 616; Downing and Locke, 2006: 449-450; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1048; Huddleston & Pullum, 2005: 188; Quirk *et al*., 1985: 1245-1252). Considering parameter (i), the gender or animacy of the antecedent, others such as Quirk *et al*. (1999: 1245-1247) classify relative pronouns in terms of gender, others such as Huddleston & Pullum (2005: 190), Biber *et al*. (1999: 612-615) and Kidd (2011:12) prefer the term ‘animacy’ in order to classify them (see Table 1). These authors suggest that relative markers in English agree with the head noun they modify in terms of animacy. Thus, depending on whether their antecedent has human (animate) or non-human (inanimate) reference, the *wh*-relativiser will vary accordingly having *personal* (*who, whom, whose*) or *non-personal* form (*which, whose*), thereby constituting a two-term ‘gender’ system that is associated with the phenomenon of *personality*
Compare the examples below containing *who* and *which*-relatives (extracted from Quirk *et al.* 1999: 1245-1246):

**Table 1. English relative pronouns: animacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Pronouns</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Which</th>
<th>Whom</th>
<th>Whose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
<td>Human antecedent (person)</td>
<td>Non-human antecedent (animal/object)</td>
<td>Human (person)</td>
<td>Human (person) + Non-human antecedent (animal/object)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16) Joan who…
The boy/ people who…
The human being who…
The fairy who…

(17) London, which…
The fox/ animals which…
The human body which…
The unicorn which

(18) a. *The people who were outside* [Personal antecedent]
b. *The thing which matter most* [Non-personal antecedent]

When there is a human antecedent, that is to say, when the relative pronoun makes reference to a person, as in example (16), the *wh*-relative pronoun that must be used is *who*. However, if there is a non-human antecedent (an animal or an object), *which* must be used, as in example (17). The examples also show that animacy is not exclusively ascribed to human beings but also to creatures in the supernatural world (*angels, elves*, etc.), which are thought of as having human characteristics such as speech. Furthermore, (18) shows that the pronoun *who* contrasts in gender with *which*, depending on whether...
the antecedent has personal (masculine or feminine) and non-personal (neutral) reference, respectively (Quirk et al., 1999: 1245-1246).

However, there are a number of precisions that need to be made (Biber et al., 1999: 612-621; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002:1048; Quirk et al., 1985: 1245-1247). The first concerns the relativisers *who* and *which* when they postmodify antecedents that denote animals. In this case both *who* and *which* are possible, as shown in (19), although *who* occurs predominantly with human antecedents:

(19)  
a. *A dog who was licking my face* [Personal antecedent]  
b. *A dog which is always barking* [Non- Personal antecedent]  
     (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1048)

In example (19a) *which* is the default choice, but *who* is by no means uncommon. *Who* conveys a greater degree of empathy or personal interest and involvement. The most obvious cases where *who* is used are in references to pets, but it is also found with other creatures (or even collections of creatures), as in these set of examples:

Likewise, although it is generally used with inanimate antecedents, *which* can also be used with human antecedents. One such case occurs when *which* is complement of auxiliary *be* in a supplementary relative clause, as in (20a) below:

(20)  
a. They accused him of being *a traitor, which, he undoubtedly was*  
b. It turned out that he wasn’t *the person who* I’d thought he was  
     (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1048)

Example (20a) illustrates the relativisation of the complement of the auxiliary verb. The relativised predicative in the supplementive *which*-relative clause is generally of ascriptive type, rather than of the identifying kind: the relative clause is concerned with the person’s properties, what kind of person he was, not his identity. *Who* would be ungrammatical here, but it could be used in the integrated relative counterpart exemplified in (20b), in which case the relative clause will have a specifying function: the issue is the identity of the person (I thought he was person x, but he turned out not to be).
They’ve got a chief executive who can provide strong leadership, which we certainly haven’t got at the moment. (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1049)

Example (21), on the other hand, illustrates the identifying type: the relative clause is concerned with the identity of the antecedent (It is not that we have not got the same chief executive, but the same kind of chief executive). This construction can be only found with supplementary relatives, but it differs from the first exception explained (ascriptive predicative complement of be) in that which is not a complement of an auxiliary verb.

The contrast between personal who and non-personal which is neutralised in the genitive case because English has only one form: whose, which therefore occurs with both personal and non-personal antecedents. Whose is considered a shorter alternative to of which + determiner, having a syntactic role comparable to the possessive determiners (Biber et al., 1999: 617; Downing and Locke, 2006: 450; Quirk et al., 1985:1249):

a. She started a home for women whose husbands were in prison
   (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1049) [personal]

b. Imagine a book whose main purpose is to explore a culture < SFURC: yes6.txt> [non-personal]

In formal registers whom may be found instead of who, which is the predominant form in informal usage (Biber et al., 1999: 615; Downing and Locke, 2006: 449; Huddleston & Pullum, 2005: 190; Quirk et al., 1985: 1251). In addition, as it is in the objective case, whom is normally resorted to when it functions as the object of a verb or a preposition in a PP, and therefore it plays a major role with the prepositional type of relatives in English, as will be further explained in chapter 2 (Biber et al., 1999: 614-615).

Now, considering the gender and number, English relative pronouns do not agree in neither gender, considering gender as the distinction between masculine and feminine, nor number with the head noun they modify. Therefore, they always present an invariable form, as it can be seen in Table 2.
Table 2. English relative pronouns: gender and number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Pronouns</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Which</th>
<th>Whom</th>
<th>Whose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender and number</td>
<td>Invariable</td>
<td>Invariable</td>
<td>Invariable</td>
<td>Invariable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English relative pronouns do not take the factor of case into account, there is no case agreement except in the formal English speech, where a contrast between the relative pronouns *who* and *whom* can be appreciated, considering the latter as the more formal relative between the two (see Table 3). Both relative pronouns work as human antecedents in relative clauses. The relative pronoun *who* presents a subjective case form, playing the role of the subject in the relative clause, whereas the relative pronoun *whom* in formal usage presents an objective case form, functioning as object of the verb or preposition within the relative clause. Nevertheless, in informal usage *whom* is often replaced by *who* (Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1249).

Table 3. English relative pronouns: case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Pronouns</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Which</th>
<th>Whom</th>
<th>Whose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>No case agreement (indeclinable)</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Possessive relative pronoun (genitive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, *whom* can be also substituted by *who* when the latter works as a complement within the relative clause: They lived in America and had one child, a girl whom/ who they idolized (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 614; Downing and Locke, 2006: 449).

When the relative pronoun does not function as the subject within the relative clause, it be substituted by a gap, a missing relativiser, that is to say, it can be removed. It is common practice when *whom* or *which* function as object in the relative clause and it is the preferred choice in both spoken and written registers. This latter type of relatives is known as bare relatives or zero relativiser (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 614-615; Downing and Locke, 2006: 450; Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1251-1252)
In (23), extracted from Huddleston & Pullum (2002:1052), the relative pronoun *which*, whose function is direct object (*OD*), can be removed because there is already a constituent which is playing the role of Subject within the relative clause (*Mary*).

Another factor we must take into account is whether the clause is restrictive or not and the role that the relative pronoun plays in the relative clause (Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, etcetera). Furthermore, in English, relative clauses follow the noun they modify and it is generally indicated by a relative pronoun at the start of the clause.

In terms of formality, the relative pronoun *that*, which is more commonly used by English speakers, does not vary in terms of animacy. This pronoun can make both reference to animals and objects or humans. Therefore, it is considered as more informal than *who* or *which*.

Paying particular attention to the contrastive relationship between *who* and *whom*, the latter plays a major role in the formal usage of the language as object of the verb or being combined with prepositions. But in informal usage, it is often replaced by *who* (see Table 4).

**Table 4. English relative pronouns: context / speech**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Pronouns</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Which</th>
<th>Whom</th>
<th>Whose</th>
<th>That</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context/speech</td>
<td>Formal (compared to</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>that</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2. *Spanish equivalents of wh-relative markers: que*

Spanish relative clauses, also denominated *oraciones subordinadas de relativo*, *oraciones relativas* or simply *relativas*, are clauses which are headed by a relative pronoun, adverb or determiner, or by the syntactic groups formed with these
expressions. (Real Academia Española, 2011: 242). Although there exist three types of relative markers (i.e. pronouns, adverbs and determiners), as already noted this study focuses on the Spanish equivalents of English who, which, whom and whose, that is to say: the pronominal forms que (often preceded by the definite article), quien and the determinative adjectives cual (always preceded by the definite article) and cuyo. (Brucart, 1999: 398). As in the case of English, these pronouns have been studied according to such categories as animacy, case, gender and number attending to their internal structure and their nature itself (Brucart, 1999: 435-445; Romero, 2014: see Resources).

Concerning que (from Latin qui), it covers that, which, who, whom and the null pronoun in their functions of subject and direct object relative pronouns, in both integrated and suppletive constructions, as shown in (24):

(24) a. Luis, que estaba en desacuerdo con la propuesta, fue destituido fulminantemente (Brucart, 1999: 411)
   ‘Luis, who disagreed with the proposal, was summarily fired’

   b. El libro que Luis te regaló es muy interesante (Brucart, 1999: 398)
   ‘The book which Luis gave you is very interesting’

In (24a), the relative pronoun que introduces the subordinate clause. The function that the relative pronoun is playing is independent from the action that the NG containing it plays within the main clause. Therefore, in (24b), El libro que Luis te regaló would be the Subject of the attributive clause, whereas the relative pronoun would function as the Direct Object of the verb regular (Brucart 1999: 398).

**Table 5. Spanish relative pronouns: que**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of relative pronoun</th>
<th>Relative pronoun que</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
<td>Human antecedent (person) + Non-human antecedent (animal/object)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Subjective/Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and number</td>
<td>Invariable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/Speech</td>
<td>The most common variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information</td>
<td>Equivalent: that, which, who, whom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Que is a relative pronoun which can be used in order to make reference to people, objects or animals. Therefore, it can post-modify human antecedents (personal) or non-human antecedents (non-personal), as shown in (25): in (25a) the relative pronoun makes reference to a person (a writer called Isabel Allende), while in (25b) que refers to an object (a book).

(25)  a. Isabel Allende es un autora popular que es de Chile
    ‘Isabel Allende is a popular writer who comes from Chile’

    b. El libro que quiero es La casa de los espíritus
    ‘The book which I want is La casa de los espíritus’
    (Rodríguez, 2013: see Resources)

Turning to the parameter of case, it should be noted that que can be found in the subjective case when it acts as Subject, or in the objective case when it functions as Direct Object. Let us consider again (25a) and (25b) above:

In (25a) it can be seen that the NG una autora popular que es de Chile functions as Complement of the Subject within the main or matrix clause. Within this Complement of the Subject, the relative clause que es de Chile acts as a Postmodifier of una autora popular. This can be characterised as a regular relative clause consisting of: (i),- a relative pronoun que, that functions as Subject and therefore occurs in the subjective or nominative case, referring to the antecedent Isabel Allende, which is also in the nominative form and plays the function of Subject in the main clause; (ii),- es, that is the Predicator ; and (iii),- de Chile that fulfils the function of Circumstantial.

Turning to (25b), El libro que quiero is a NG that functions as Subject within the matrix clause. El libro is postmodified by the relative clause, que quiero, where the relative pronoun que function as OD and therefore is in the objective case, an implicit yo (elliptical ‘I’) would be the Subject, and, finally, quiero is the Predicator.
In terms of gender, the examples in (26) illustrate that the relative pronoun *que* presents an invariable form that may refer to either a masculine or a feminine antecedent, as it occurs to its English equivalent, *who*.

(26)  
   a. *El actor que interpreta al profesor Arthur Seldom*  
   \(<SFURC: Sp no_2_12.txt>\)  
   ‘*The actor who plays the role of professor Arthur Seldom*’  
   b. *El personaje principal Juno, que se nos presenta como una chica descarada*  
   \(<SFURC: Sp no_2_13.txt>\)  
   ‘*The main character Juno, who is introduced to us as an insolent girl*’

In (26a) *que* refers to masculine nouns *actor* and *profesor*, whereas in (26b) *que* postmodifies *Juno*, which is the name of a girl, thereby showing that *que* can be used with both masculine and feminine antecedents.

Considering the category of number, *que* is an invariable form that can be used with both singular and plural antecedents in Spanish. This is illustrated in (27):

(27)  
   a. *Se introduce una historia de amor que ya se rozó en la segunda parte entre Davy Jones y una mujer*  
   \(<SFURC: Sp no_2_20.txt>\)  
   ‘*A love story between Davy Jones and one woman, which has already been touched in the second part, is introduced*’

   b. *Ni bomberos ni policía, que se supone que saben (o deberían) hacerse respetar*  
   \(<SFURC: Sp no_1_15.txt>\)  
   ‘*Neither firemen nor policemen, who are supposed to know (or at least they should) how to win respect*’

In (27a) the relative pronoun postmodifies a single entity or a singular noun (*una historia de amor*), while in (27b), the same pronoun refers to two entities that have plural reference (*bomberos* and *policía*) and agree in number with their corresponding predications that also have a plural form (*saben* and *deberían*).
Turning now to the next marker, *quien* (from Latin *quem*, the accusative form of *qui* (= ‘who’)). It is the Spanish equivalent of *whom*. It can also be replaced by *(el) que* in non-restrictive relative clauses. Like *who* and *whom*, *quien* can only be used to refer to people, and is invariable for gender. Although it was originally invariable for number, the plural form, *Quienes* emerged by analogy with other plural form so that *quien* as a plural form has survived as an archaism and is now considered a non-standard form. This is expressed in table format in Table 6 and exemplified in (28) and (29).

**Table 6. Spanish relative pronouns: quien**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of relative pronoun</th>
<th>Relative pronoun quien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
<td>Human antecedent (person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Subjective/ Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and number</td>
<td>Invariable in gender, not in number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/ Speech</td>
<td>It often appears after prepositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information</td>
<td>Plural form: <em>quiennes</em>. Equivalent: <em>who</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28) Quizá la ironía de que *Juno*, *quien* supuestamente debería ser la adolescente irresponsable, sea finalmente una tía supermadura, <SFURC: Sp no_2_13.txt>

‘Maybe the irony that *Juno*, *who* should be supposedly an irresponsible teenager, is in the end a very mature guy’

In (28) *quien* makes reference to *Juno*, which is the name of a girl.

(29) *Productores Dino y Martha De Laurentiis quienes* ya adaptaron la primera novela de Harris, "El dragón rojo" <SFURC: Sp yes_4_18.txt>

‘*Producers Dino and Martha De Laurentiis who* already adapted Harris’ first novel, *The red dragon*’

In example (28) *quien* refers to a singular human antecedent (*Juno*), whereas in (29) *quiennes* refers to plural human antecedents (*Dino and Martha*).
As shown in Table 6 above, the Spanish relative pronoun *quien(es)* often appears after prepositions, as illustrated in (30) to (32), but this type of prepositional *wh*-relatives will be further described in chapter 2.

(30) *La persona a quien* me refiero no está aquí

‘The person to whom I am referring is not here’

(31) Necesito *alguien con quien* sincerarme

‘I need someone with whom I can open up’

(32) Ellos, para *quienes* nada valía el dinero, nos ofrecían de nuevo un ejemplo de desprendida generosidad

‘They, for whom money did not worth, offered a new example of detached generosity’ (Brucart, 1999: 442)

Let us consider *cual*, which refers to both human and non-human antecedents, distinguishes three grammatical cases and presents four variants in gender and number, as represented in Table 7 (Brucart, 1999: 498; Romero, 2014). Examples (33) and (34) extracted from (Romero, 2014), as well as examples (35) to (37) illustrate these features.

Table 7. Spanish relative pronouns: *cual*

| Type of relative pronoun | Relative pronoun *cual*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
<td>Human antecedent (person) + Non-human antecedent (animal/object)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Subjective/ Objective (+ prepositions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and number</td>
<td>Gender and number distinctions: masculine/ feminine --- singular/ plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/ Speech</td>
<td>Equivalents: <em>who, which</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information</td>
<td><em>El cual, la cual, los cuales, las cuales</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(33) *El libro sobre el cual* discutimos ayer es muy interesante

‘The book about *which* we discussed yesterday is very interesting’
In both (33) and (34) the antecedents of *el cual* have a singular reference, but they differ in gender: the former has a masculine, singular non-personal antecedent (*libro*), whereas the latter post-modifies a masculine, singular antecedent that refers to a person (*Velázquez*).

In example (35), the relative pronoun *la cual* is feminine and singular. Therefore, it concords in gender and number with its antecedent *Madame Bovary*, which, by the way, is a feminine noun referring to a single entity. In (36) the relative pronoun *los cuales* agrees in gender and number with *flash backs*, which is presented as a masculine antecedent referring to a plural entity. Finally, in (37), *las cuales* refer to *the Chairman’s daughters*, a feminine plural antecedent.

To summarise, this relative marker may have four different forms in Spanish resulting from gender and number variation: *-el cual, la cual, los cuales, las cuales*- . In terms of animacy, it can refer to both personal (34 and 37) and non-personal antecedents (33, 35, 36), and it may be the Subject of the relative subclause as in (34 and 36), or it may
fulfill other functions such as OD, as in (37), OI, as in (35), or Prepositional Object (OP), as in (33).

Finally, Table 8 and examples (38) to (41) summarise the defining characteristics of the relative marker *cuyo* and its variants *cuya, cuyos, cuyas*. It can be seen that this relative possessive pronoun has gender and number inflections. However, it should be stressed that, unlike other relative markers, *cuyo(s)-a(s)* do not concord with their antecedents, indicating the owner or possessor, but rather with ‘what is owned’ (the word which comes after the relativiser in bold), which is the head of the NG in which they behave as possessive relative determiners.

Table 8. The features of *cuyo(s)-a(s)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of relative pronoun</th>
<th>Relative pronoun <em>cuyo</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
<td>Human antecedent (person) + Non-human antecedent (animal/object)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Genitive case (possessive pronoun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and number</td>
<td>Gender and number: 4 distinctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masculine/ feminine ---- singular/ plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context/ Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information</td>
<td><em>Cuyo, cuya, cuyos, cuyas</em>. Equivalent to whose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(38) Ángela.- la reportera del programa, **cuyo** mayor interés es obtener en imágenes todo lo que va sucediendo. <SFURC: Sp no_1_5.txt>

‘Ángela, the reporter of the TV programme, *whose* major interest is to get pictures of what is happening’

(39) ‘Mientras usted duerme’es el nombre del programa televisivo para el que trabajan Ángela y Pablo, y **cuya** misión del día es hacer un reportaje de la vida nocturna en un parque de bomberos <SFURC: Sp no_1_5.txt>

‘Mientras usted duerme’ is the name of a TV programme for which Ángela and Pablo work, and *whose* mission of the day is to do a story about night life in a fire station’
Linguini se convertirá en un gran chef cuyos platos pedirán todos los clientes del restaurante, sin que nadie sepa que el auténtico genio es Remy.

‘Linguini will become a great chef whose dishes will be ordered by all the clients, without knowing that Remy is the actual genius’

un signo diferente en cada ocasión que, muerte a muerte, va dando forma a una serie cuyas respuestas deberían descifrar los protagonistas.

‘A different sign for each occasion, which death after death, shapes a series whose answers should be deciphered by the protagonists’

The previous examples illustrate the four distinctions of cuyo concerning gender and number. Whereas examples (38) and (39) reveal that the relativiser whose refers to singular varieties, in examples (40) and (41) whose alludes to the plural ones. Concerning gender, the four variants of whose can be classified as masculine, in the case of (38) and (40) or as feminine, in the case of examples (39) and (41).

1.3.3. German equivalents of wh-relative markers: der, die, das

German, unlike English or Spanish, presents a list of highly inflected relative pronouns, that result from case inflections that are heavily influenced by Latin. In addition, German pronouns can be divided into two different varieties in terms of definiteness, depending on whether they allude to referents or entities which are not (indefinite noun phrases). However, German relative clauses can only be constructed with definite pronouns (Brand et al., 2008: 327; Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013:10,34; Lehmann,1984 :36; Krenn & Volk, 1993.). It can thus be concluded that definiteness is the most relevant classification criterion that works across the three languages under analysis. In German, the most common variety of relative pronouns, der, die and das (=’who’), is based on the definite articles, but with distinctive forms in the genitive (dessen,deren) and in the dative plural (denen), as shown in Tables 9 and 10 and examples (42) to (47). According to Duden (1880: see Resources), a German dictionary covering different aspects such as loanwords, etymology, pronunciation or synonyms,
the 85% of all German relative clauses are constructed on the basis of definite articles (der, die, das). Historically this specific variety of definite relative pronouns are related to the English relative pronoun that.

Table 9. German relative pronouns der, die, das: nominative and accusative cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kasus</th>
<th>Maskulin</th>
<th>Feminin</th>
<th>Neutrum</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominativ</td>
<td>der</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>das</td>
<td>die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkusativ</td>
<td>den</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>das</td>
<td>die</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. German relative pronouns der, die, das: dative and genitive cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kasus</th>
<th>Maskulin</th>
<th>Feminin</th>
<th>Neutrum</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dativ</td>
<td>dem</td>
<td>der</td>
<td>dem</td>
<td>den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitiv</td>
<td>dessen</td>
<td>deren</td>
<td>dessen</td>
<td>deren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(42) Ein Mitarbeiter, der einen Führerschein hat.
‘A worker who has driving license’

(43) Wir suchen eine Stylistin, die kreativ ist.
‘We are looking for a stylist who is creative’

(44) Wir sind ein internationales Unternehmen, das für seinen technischen Vorsprung bekannt ist (Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013: 165)
‘We are an international company which is known because of its technical projection’

(45) Im Nachbarbett liegt der Obdachlose Lucas (Paul Dano, “Little Miss Sunshine”), dessen Selbstmordversuch gerade gescheitert ist [genitive-dessen] <SFURC: Gm ja_25_5.txt>
‘Lucas, whose suicide attempt has just failed, is in the neighbouring bed’
Eine Rede, deren Sinn keiner recht versteht  

‘A voice, whose meaning no one understands’

Sequenzen, in denen Nina sich tatsächlich in einen schwarzen Schwan zu verwandeln scheint

‘Sequences in which Nina actually turns into a black swan’

The second variety, on the other hand, is considered as more literary and it is used for mere emphasis. The German relative pronouns belonging to this second variety are welcher, welche and welches (= which or who), as follows:

Er traf den Mann, welcher der Erfinder des Gummibärchens ist.

‘He met the man who is the inventor of gummy bears’

(Krenn & Volk, 1993)

Moving on the next criterion, animacy, unlike in English and Spanish, in German the same relative pronouns can be used with either human or non-human antecedents, as shown in (49) and (50) where das is used to postmodify a human (das Kind ‘the kid’) and a non-human antecedent (Das Kleid ‘the dress’), respectively.

Du bist das Kind, das ich gern habe (Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013:164)

‘You are the kid whom I like’

Das Kleid, das ich dem Mädchen gab, ist hübsch (Lehmann, 1984: 111)

‘The dress which I gave to the girl is beautiful’

Turning to gender, in contrast with English, in which grammatical gender cannot be found, there are several Indo-European languages such as Spanish, Russian, Hindi or German whose relative pronouns have different forms according to gender. In German there are three different grammatical gender distinctions: masculine, feminine and neuter (Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013:8-17).
Masculine gender *der* is applied to nouns that denote specifically male persons (or animals), as in (51) and (57); female gender *die* is used with those nouns that denote specifically female persons (or animals) that are normally attributed a feminine gender, as in (52) and (56); the neuter form *(das)* is employed to denote mainly non-human entities as in (53) and words inherited from other languages such as Latin or French, as in (54). There are certain exceptional nouns whose gender does not follow the denoted sex. For instance, this is the case of *Mädchen* “girl”-in (55)-, which is a diminutive of *Magd*, and all diminutive forms are neuter in German (Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013: 8-17).

(51) *Der Mann, der im Keller singt, ist mein Vater*
   ‘The man who sings in the cellar is my father’

(52) Auf seinem Arbeitsplatz bekommt Greg Besuch von *der attraktiven Andi Garcia, die ihn unbedingt gewinnen will.* < SFURC: Gm ja_8_4.txt >
   ‘At his workplace receives Greg the visit of the attractive Andie Garcia, who wants to convince him’.

(53) Im O-Ton hat er zudem einen *extrem britischen Akzent, das kommt in der deutschen Version dann nicht so klar heraus* < SFURC: Gm ja_3_5.txt >
   ‘In the original version he also has a very British accent, which in the German version comes not so clear out’

(54) *Das Faktum, das nicht zutrifft* (Lehmann, 1984: 46)
   ‘The fact which is not applied’

(55) *Das Mädchen, das klein ist, lacht* (Lehmann, 1984: 195)
   ‘The girl who is short laughs’

(56) *Die Frau, die den Reis für die Kinder kaufte* (Lehmann, 1984: 242)
   ‘The woman who bought rice for the children’

(57) *Der Mann, der Peter geholfen hat* (Brand et al., 2008: 332)
‘The man who has helped Peter’

As regards the second variety of relative pronouns in German, welcher (who, which, que or quien) corresponds to masculine grammatical gender, welche (who, which, que or quien) would be feminine and finally welches (who, which, que or quien) would belong to the neuter division. According to Krenn & Volk (1993: see Resources) der- die- das can often be substituted by this second variety of relative markers, as shown in (58), where welcher occupies the same position as der within the clause. Welcher also possesses masculine gender and singular number and it can be also translated as ‘who’. In addition, this second variety of relative pronouns is employed in order to avoid the clash of homonymous words, as in (58b), where der appears twice within the clause.

(58)  a. Er traf den Mann, welcher der Erfinder des Gummibärchens ist.

        b. Er traf den Mann, der der Erfinder des Gummibärchens ist.

‘He met the man who was the inventor of gummy bears’

Considering the category of number, German relative pronouns have variants to agree in number with their corresponding antecedents, as illustrated in (59) and (60).

(59)  Der Mann, der im Keller singt, ist mein Vater (SG) (Krenn & Volk, 1993)

‘The man who sings in the cellar is my father’

(60)  Die Männer, die er sah, kannte er gut. (PL) (Krenn & Volk, 1993)

‘The men who he saw are well known to him’

As regards the previous examples concerning number agreement, in (59) both antecedent and relativiser are singular words, expressing that the referent is only one man. On the other hand, example (60) presents the opposite case: both the antecedent and the relativiser are plural, indicating that the referent was not one man, but many. Comparing German and English structures concerning number agreement, we can highlight that while English who is invariable, referring to a singular entity or to several, in German there are different variants to distinguish between singular and plural.
Turning to the category of case, unlike English and Spanish, German relative pronouns may adopt five different grammatical cases, i.e. nominative (Subject) -as in (61)-, accusative (OD)-as in (62)-, dative (OI)-as in (63)- and genitive or the possessive case-as in (64)-, depending on the syntactic function they fulfill in the relative clause (Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013: 164)

(61) *Der Hut, der alt ist* [Nominativ] (Lehmann, 1984: 189)
    ‘The hat *which* is old’

(62) *Der Mann, den ich sehe* [Akkusativ] (Lehmann, 1984: 242)
    ‘The man *whom* I see’

(63) *Du bist der Mann, dem ich mein Herz schenke* [Dativ] (Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013: 164)
    ‘You are the man *to whom* I give my heart’

(64) *Ein Junge, dessen Mutter krank ist* [Genitiv] (Lehmann, 1984: 98)
    “A young boy *whose* mother is ill”

2. Prepositional relative clauses

In traditional grammars the category of preposition has been defined as a word that governs, and normally precedes, a noun or pronoun and which expresses the latter’s relation to another word (Ibáñez, 2004; cf. also Biber et al., 1999: 74; Downing and Locke, 2006:16; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 598, 626-63, 1039-1043, Quirk et al., 1985: 657). The following parameters are commonly resorted to in order to distinguish prepositions from other categories (Biber et al., 1999: 74; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002:603; Quirk et al., 1985: 650-663).

i) Complements: the most central prepositions can take NP complements
ii) Functions: All prepositions can head PPs functioning as non-predicateive adjunct; many can also head PPs in complement function.
iii) Modifiers: A subset of prepositions are distinguished by their acceptance of such adverbs as right and straight as modifiers.

iv) Negative properties. Prepositions are distinguished from verbs and nouns, for example, in that they do not inflect for tense or number and do not take determiners as dependents.

In English, relative pronouns that have different (non-genitive) case forms almost invariably appear in the accusative case after prepositions, so the issue of case government is of less importance and many definitions omit it (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 598, 626-663, 1039-1043). In Spanish prepositional relatives, a specific type known as oblique relatives and their relationship with the definite article acquires importance (Brucart, 1999:494). In German, however, case government is given a major role within the clause (Gottstein-Schramm et al., 2013:114). Further details for each language are offered in turn.

2.1. Prepositional wh-relatives in English

Wh-relativisers can be the complements of a preposition in a PP, which generally performs the function of Adjunct at clause/sentence level. The most common patterns in which English prepositional relatives can be found is illustrated below (extracted from Biber et al., 1999: 624,625):

i) Preposition + relativizer:

(65) *The apartments in which no one lives* [in+which]

(66) *The endless landscape from which the sand is taken*

ii) Preposition stranding, which will be discussed in section 2.1.1.

(67) *The one that old James used to live in*

iii) Omission of the preposition altogether, in which case no surface marker of the adverbial gap is provided, and the relativiser can be also omitted:

(68) *The day that he left, the way I look at it.* (Biber et al., 1999: 624)
iv) There are three relative adverbs that specifically mark adverbial gaps: *where* in place Adjuncts, *when* in Time Adjuncts and *why* in reason Adjuncts.

(69) *The hospital* where *she* spent 63 hours

(70) I can’t think of *a time* when *I* would be going by myself

(71) You are the *reason* why *I* left school

According to Biber *et al.* (1999: 625) the most common prepositional *wh*-relatives are those headed by *in which, to which, from which, at which, on which,* which are illustrated in examples (72) to (79).

(72) *Wellesley College, an all-women school in Massachusetts* where *she* has been hired to teach in the art department for its students. <SFURC: En no1.txt>

(73) I can’t think of *a time* when *I* would be going by myself (Biber *et al.* 1999: 626)

(74) *It still doesn’t have the freshness of what to expect for a film made for the Oscars,* which is one huge reason why this film was made <SFURC: En no1.txt>

(75) Julia Stiles makes get a great speech in toward the end *in which* she basically plays the kettle calling the pot black in return. <SFURC: En no2.txt>

(76) *Katsumoto says to Nathan on the dawn of battle:* “You think a man can change his destiny?” *To which* Cruise replies: I believe a man does what he can, until his destiny is revealed”. <SFURC: yes8.txt>

(77) This is the article *from which* they were quoting (Huddleston & Pullum 2005:186)

(78) *The fancy-dress party, at which* the men all turned up as gangsters, was held in Manhattan (BBC Learning) [*At which* is considered to be an equivalent to *where* and *in which*].
2.1.1. Preposition stranding

Preposition stranding in English, a phenomenon also known as *preposition deferring* or *orphaned preposition* refers to a syntactic construction in which a preposition appears at the end of a sentence without a following object. (Quirk et al., 1985: 663).

Preposition stranding occurs in a variety of sentence constructions but primarily in relative clauses, as shown in (80). Furthermore, it tends to be found more often in speech than in formal writing, and with its relativiser omitted. In constructions like the following the preposition is said to be stranded (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 626):

(80)  

a. What was she referring to?  

b. This is the book she was referring to

Here *to* is stranded in the sense that its complement does not follow it as expected from, but it is somewhere else in the construction. In (80a) the complement of *to* is *what*, which occurs initially as demanded by direct *wh*-interrogatives, while in (80b) the complement of *to* is a relative gap that refers to *the book*.

Although general use prefers placing the preposition at the end of the relative clause and even omitting the relative pronoun, relativisers in the form *[preposition+*which*] or *[preposition + whom]* are common in academic registers – as in (81a) and (82a)-. Furthermore, they are considered to be more formal than *who* or *which* structures – as in (81b) and (82b)-, which tend to omit the relativiser and place the preposition at the very end of the clause -as in (81c) and (82c)-. This second type of prepositional relatives combined with *which* or *whom* receive the name of fronted prepositions or preposition fronting. This contrast produced between fronted and stranded prepositions is illustrated in the following examples below:

(81)  

a. The table **under which** the boy crawled  

b. The table **which** the boy crawled **under**  

c. The table () the boy crawled **under**
(82)  a. *The lady towards whom* the dog ran  
    b. *The lady who* the dog ran towards  
    c. *The lady ()* the dog ran towards

In conclusion, sequences [preposition + *which*] or [preposition + *whom*], belonging to preposition fronting, are common only in academic prose, whereas registers in which prepositions are usually placed at the end of relative clauses (stranding) are labeled as non-academic. A less common relativiser option would be concentrated on stranding the preposition at the gap position. This variant, which is occasionally used in conversation, is often used with the relativiser omitted (Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1252-1253). Surprisingly enough, despite the frequency of the construction, preposition stranding has been generally condemned in traditional prescriptive grammars on the assumption that “it is incorrect to end a sentence with a preposition” (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 628), but this position is not shared in descriptive studies that describe actual usage (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 624-625; Downing and Locke, 2006: 556; Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1251-1257).

2.1.2. *The relative pronoun whom*

As already noted, the relative pronoun *who* is identified with a nominative form, while *whose* and *whom* are said to be in the genitive and accusative case, respectively (Biber *et al.*, 1999: 614; Downing and Locke, 2006:449; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 190; Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1249). In prepositional constructions, *whom* instead of *who* is used because this relativiser acts as the complement of a preposition within a PP, in which case according to English grammar the accusative case is preferred, as in (83), (extracted from Quirk *et al.*, 1985: 1249).

(83)  The person *to whom* he spoke

Nevertheless, in less formal speech and writing *whom* is commonly avoided by stranding the preposition (a phenomenon that had already been discussed in the previous section) and replacing *whom* by *who, that* or zero, as shown in (84) and (85), (extracted from Quirk *et al.*,1985:1249).

(84)  The person *who* he spoke *to*

(85)  The person () he spoke *to*
2.2. Spanish equivalents of prepositional *wh*-relatives

In order to study relative pronouns with prepositions in Spanish, there are three different approaches we must consider: *oblique relatives* and *relatives with elliptical antecedent* (Bosque *et al.*, 1999: 49; Real Academia Española, 2011: 245)

2.2.1. Types of prepositional relatives

i) Oblique relatives or Spanish *relativas oblicuas*

This type of relatives is characterized by the following structure: [preposition + definite article + Spanish *que*]. In oblique relatives headed by *que*, the Spanish language allows, in some cases, the absence of the definite article between the preposition and the relative (Brucart, 1999: 494):

(86) *El libro* con el que me obsequió estudia la pintura de Frida Kahlo
(87) *El libro* con que me obsequió estudia la pintura de Frida Kahlo
    ‘The book *which* he gave me studies Frida Kahlo’s paintworks’

Sentences including the article, such as (86), can appear with any preposition and with any sort of antecedent. However, the second example (87) is submitted to certain restrictions. The only case in which the oblique relative without article is preferred is produced when the relative refers to a predicative antecedent, as it happens with clauses expressing manner. These elements are often relativised by means of the relative adverb *como*, but they also admit the prepositional construction headed by *que*, as the following examples illustrate (Brucart, 1999: 494):

(88) *El modo* en/con que fuimos tratados fue humillante
(89) ?? *El modo* en/con el que fuimos tratados fue humillante
    ‘The way *in which* we were treated was humiliating’

In the rest of cases, oblique relatives with definite article are always preferred to those oblique relatives that dispense with it. The latter are submitted to certain restrictions. As
a consequence, oblique relatives characterised by the absence of article present a series
of fixed features or conditions, which will be later discussed in section 2.2.2.

ii) Relatives with elliptical antecedent

This subtype of relative clauses, which is characterised by the elision of the relative
marker, concerns two types of clauses known as free and semi-free relatives. According
to the Real Academia Española, free relatives are those which are introduced by
variable relativisers such as quien and cuanto (Quien dice eso miente.), as well as by the
invariable relativisers donde, cuando or como (Lo veré cuando llegue.). Semi-free
relatives, on the other hand, are those relatives which are headed by the relative pronoun
que preceded by the definite article (El que la hace la paga.). Examples have been
extracted from (Real Academia Española, 2011: 243)

(90) Quien dice eso miente
‘Whoever says that lies’

(91) Lo veré cuando llegue
‘I will see it when I arrive’

(92) El que la hace la paga
‘He who does it, pays for it’

iii) Other formal constituents

As already explained in previous sections, Spanish relative nexuses are pronoun que, it
is the most generally used relativiser in Spanish, appearing in both restrictive and non-
restrictive clauses and being able to play any syntactic role in both types of clauses.
From a morphological point of view, it lacks inflections. In addition, its only lexical
feature corresponds with its double condition of subordinator and anaphoric element.

(93) a. El lugar donde lo encontraron era poco accesible
‘The place where they found him was a bit difficult to get to’
b. El lugar *en el que* lo encontraron era poco accesible.
   ‘The place *in which* they found him was a bit difficult to get to’

(94) a. El momento *cuando* se decidió a hablar no fue el más oportuno
   ‘The moment *when* she decided to speak was not the right one’

   b. El momento *en el que* se decidió a hablar no fue el más oportuno
   ‘The moment *in which* she decided to speak was not the right one’

(95) a. El modo *como* actuó fue improcedente
   ‘The way *how* he acted was inappropriate’

   b. El modo *en que* actuó fue improcedente
   ‘The way *in which* he acted was inappropriate’
   (Romero, 2014: see Resources)

Analyzing this relative pronoun accompanied by prepositional structures, we must make a distinction between:

i) Prepositions as relative adverbs, with lexical content and functioning as nexus of the corresponding subordinate clauses, as shown in (93a), (94a) and (95a) extracted from Brucart (1999:491)

ii) [Preposition + que] This structure differentiates itself from other relative pronouns, adjectives and from the adverbs within the same type or class, which incorporate an additional lexical content apart from their function as nexus of the subordinate clause. In order to function as relative adverbs, they must be preceded by a preposition which indicates the relation they express. As shown in (93b), (94b) and (95b) extracted from (Brucart,1999: 491)

(96) El escritor *al que* premiaron anoche vendrá a nuestra tertulia próximamente
   ‘The writer *to whom* they rewarded last night will attend our talking shop soon’
Taking the previous example extracted from Brucart (1999: 491) as reference, different features concerning the use of (el) que within prepositional relative clauses must be explained. Among other characteristics, the presence and role of the definite article is highlighted. The definite article must concord with the antecedent. In example (85), the antecedent is the masculine singular noun escritor (writer). Therefore, the article presents masculine gender and singular number (el). On the other hand, the presence of this article in these cases may be obligatory depending on the preposition accompanying the relative word.

### 2.2.2. Omission of the article in Spanish prepositional relatives

Oblique relatives, which can be also labeled as relativos complejos or relativos compuestos in Spanish, present the following structure: preposition + definite article + relative cual/que:

- Definite article + cual, in which the omission of the article cannot be produced.
- Definite article + que, in which the omission of the article depends on certain conditions. (Brucart, 1999: 490-502)

To narrow down our study, the description will focus on prepositional oblique relatives with omitted definite article + que, whose structure will be taken into consideration for the analysis in section 3. According to Brucart (1999:494-495), relative que may be omitted under certain conditions that relate to the following factors: (i) type of preposition, (ii) type of relative clause, (iii) type of antecedent, and (iv) the syntactic structure of the relative clause.

Only monosyllabic prepositions such as a, con, de, en may be omitted within a relative clause. However, there is an exception concerning preposition por, which can be omitted sporadically in certain cases, as in (97) and (98) (extracted from Brucart, 1999: 495; Romero, 2014: see Resources).

(97)  *La novela a que se refiere* fue escrita al comienzo de su carrera

   ‘*The novel to which she is referring* was written at the beginning of her career’
(98)  El abrazo con que me despidió fue emocionante  
‘The hug with which he said goodbye was moving’

(99)  a. Le regalé la pluma con que había escrito alguna de mis novelas  
b. Le regalé la pluma con la que había escrito alguna de mis novelas.  
‘I gave her the pen with which I had written some of my novels’

(100)  La verdadera razón por que quieres quedarte es Miguel, ¿no es verdad?  
‘The real reason why you want to stay is Miguel, isn’t it?’

(101)  El ideal por que luchaban era inasequible  
‘The ideal for which they fought was unaffordable’

Concerning the type of relative clause, the omission of the article is considered to be more frequent in restrictive relative clauses, as in (100) and (101). In contrast, a major role is given to the omission produced in non-restrictive clauses, in the Spanish language spoken in the Americas. When referring to Peninsular Spanish, however, the omission of the article in non-restrictive clauses would be considered an archaism. Furthermore, the polarity of the subordinate clause must be also taken into account, if omission is produced the subordinate clause cannot be negative, as in (102).

(102)  Mi padre me prestó el dinero del que yo no disponía  
‘My father lent me the money which I did not have’  
(Brucart, 1999: 495)

Turning to the question of the antecedent, the article within the oblique relative is always omitted when the antecedent is composed by definite articles rather than with indefinite articles. In addition, there are some lexical preferences when omitting the article: the use of antecedent which may indicate circumstances of the action such as: time, place, manner, etc. (a la hora en que, el día en que, la manera en que...), as in (103).

(103)  El modo en que puedo explicártelo  
‘The manner in which I can explain it to you’  
(Romero, 2014: see Resources)
Another factor that must be taken into consideration in order to omit the article within an oblique relative clause would be the syntactic function played by the relative group within the subordinate clause. Omission is usually produced in adjuncts (of place, manner, time, etc.), as in (104).

(104) *La casa en que vive* no es demasiado lujosa  
‘*The house in which she lives* is not luxurious’  
(Romero, 2014: see Resources)

### 2.3. German equivalents of prepositional *wh*-relatives

This section focuses on the analysis of prepositional relatives in German. In order to study German relative pronouns with prepositions, we must considerate: prepositions governed by accusative and dative forms (*dual prepositions*), *declinable and indeclinable prepositional relative pronouns*, of which only the former constructions will be taken into consideration for the empirical analysis (section 3) (Gottstein-Schramm *et al.*, 2013: 114, 165; Lehmann, 1984: 318-324).

#### 2.3.1. German prepositions

Compared to English and Spanish, German prepositions are complex grammatical elements because they are associated to variations of case. Although prepositions are invariable, the complements they normally precede may be in the accusative, dative or genitive case, and as a result, prepositions are assigned to one of these three cases. The rules governing this assignment are summarised in section 2.3.2.1 when describing relative pronouns, while section 2.3.2.2 focuses on the indeclinable type. We shall see that prepositions in German have a specific and restricted meaning which requires German speakers to know which preposition fits best in a specific context. For instance, the English preposition *to* can be translated into at least six different ways in German.
2.3.1.1. Declinable prepositional relative pronouns

We have said that in German prepositions are case-governed. For example, prepositions such as *durch*, *für* or *um* are always associated with the accusative case, whereas other common prepositions such as *bei*, *mit*, *von* or *zu* are always governed by the dative. A list of prepositions with their corresponding is presented in Table 11, and illustrations of prepositional relative clauses are offered in (105) to (111), extracted from a webpage specialized in German preposition (see Resources).

Table 11. Prepositions and their cases in German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Akkusativ</th>
<th>Akkusativ/Dativ</th>
<th>Dativ</th>
<th>Genitiv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bis</td>
<td>An, Auf, In</td>
<td>Ab, An</td>
<td>Anstatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durch</td>
<td>Neben, Über, Vor</td>
<td>Aus, Entgegen</td>
<td>Aufgrund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Für</td>
<td>Unter, Zwischen</td>
<td>Außer, Entsprechend</td>
<td>Außerhalb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gegen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bei, Mit</td>
<td>Dank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entgegen</td>
<td>Statt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entsprechend</td>
<td>Während</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mit, Nach</td>
<td>Wegen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(105) *Das soll nicht negativ klingen, den die Figur des Pater Benedetto* (Paolo Bonacelli), *mit dem* Clooney interessante Dialoge führt*  
‘The aim is not to sound so negative, due to the character of *Pater Benedetto* with *whom* Clooney conducts interesting dialogues’

(106) *Die Fabrik, in der ich arbeitete, ist geschlossen worden* (Lehmann, 1984:86)  
‘The factory in which I worked has closed’

(107) *Der Alte, bei dem ich mich nach dem Weg erkundigt habe, war ausgerechnet taub* (Lehmann, 1984: 65)  
‘The old man, to whom I inquired about the way, happened to be deaf’

(108) *Tisch, an dem man essen kann* (Lehmann, 1984: 57)  
‘A table on which we can eat’

---

3 Prepositions in bold type are the most frequent ones in German. Consequently, these highlighted prepositions are the ones which will head in the examples provided.
(109) *Tisch, unter dem er sich versteckt* (Lehmann, 1984:66)

‘A table **under which** he hides himself’

(110) Hans sah *den Zoo, aus dem die Affen ausgerissen sind* (Lehmann, 1984: 90)

‘Hans saw the zoo, **from which** the monkeys escaped’

(111) Dies sind *die Frauen, über die ich sprach* (Lehmann, 1984: 78)

‘These are the women **about whom** I talked’

Focusing on the wide range of German prepositions, there is a specific type known as *dual prepositions*. Dual-prepositions (also called *two-way* or *doubtful prepositions*) such as *an, auf* or *in* (the whole series of prepositions belonging to this group is listed in Table 12 below) are prepositions which can take either the accusative or dative case, depending on the meaning of the sentence (Gottstein-Schramm *et al.*, 2013:112-117). They are used with accusatives when they express direction, and with datives when location is implied, as shown in (112) and (113)

**Table 12. The dual-preposition group**

| The dual-preposition group | an, auf, hinter, in, neben, über, unter, vor, zwischen |

(112) *Schule, in die der Mann geht* (Lehmann, 1984: 53)

‘The school **to which** the man goes’

(113) *Das Haus, in dem Mario wohnte ist abgebrannt* (Lehmann, 1984: 58)

‘The house **in which** Mario lived has been destroyed by fire’

In example (112) the preposition *in* indicates a movement or direction (*‘to school’*) because it is complemented by a feminine, singular and accusative relativiser (*die*) that refers back to *Schule*. By assuming accusative case, the prepositional relative indicates a movement or direction, answering where to the man is going (*to school*).
On the other hand, in example (113) *in* expresses a place (‘in the house’) because it precedes a neuter, singular and dative relativiser (*dem*) alluding to previously mentioned *Das Haus*.

2.3.2.2. Indeclinable prepositional relative pronouns

There are two types of indeclinable prepositional relative pronouns:

(i) indeclinable relative pronouns which make reference to the whole clause and (ii) indeclinable relative pronouns making reference to a noun or a pronoun. In type (i) relative pronouns do not make reference to a specific noun, but to the whole sentence. The most frequent forms are structures led by *wo* *(r)* + preposition, as follows: *wobei* (*wo* + *bei*), *worauf* (*wo* + *(r)* + *auf*), *wofür* (*wo* + *für*), *worüber* (*wo* + *(r)* + *über*), *woraus* (*wo* + *(r)* + *aus*), as shown in (114) to (116).

(114) Es handelt sich um *das Remake von Karate Kid*, *wobei* der Name komplett gleich geblieben ist. <SFURC: Gm ja_18_5.txt>
‘This is a new version of Karate Kid, *in which* the name has remained completely the same’

(115) *Das* ist es, *worauf* ich gewartet habe (Lehmann, 1984: 361)
‘That is *for which* I have been waiting’

(116) Da sind nur *die Äste der Bäume*, *worunter* sie schlafen (Lehmann, 1984: 361)
‘There are only the branches of the trees *under which* they sleep’

(ii) Turning to (ii), indeclinable relative pronouns that make reference to a noun or pronoun, they can be subdivided into two subcategories depending on whether their antecedent is *inanimate* or *animate*. When the antecedent is a noun or a pronoun referring to an inanimate entity or thing, only two indefinite pronominal relative adverbs can be used: *wo*, as in (117) and (118) or *da*, as in (119) and (120).
Die Präsidentschaft ist etwas, wonach Herr Serpa seit langem strebt.
‘The Presidency is something to which Herr Serpa aspires since long time ago’

Das ist der Dolch, womit sie ermordet wurde
‘This is the dagger with which she was killed’

Dealing with the structures headed by wo and taking into consideration examples (114) to (116) on the one hand, and examples (117) and (118) on the other hand, the only difference that we observe is the change of referents. Whereas the former present wo as a particle referring to the whole preceding clause, the latter present wo as a particle which refers to the preceding pronoun or noun. Furthermore, examples (115) and (116) include the annotation <r>, which means that an <r> must be added in prepositions that have a vowel or Umlaut (DWDS, see Resources) with such resulting relativisers such as worauf or worunter.

Die Menschen stürmten die Kaufhäuser, denn darauf hatten sie schon lange gewartet
‘Those people rushed into the shops for which they have been long waiting’

Example (119) illustrates the [Da+(r) + Präposition] scheme, where an (-r-) must be added in those prepositions that have a vowel or Umlaut, constituting relativisers such as daraus, darüber, dabei or darin, as in (120) (extracted from ‘Deutsch Akademie’, see Resources).

Deine Karte aus dem Urlaub, darüber ich mir wirklich sehr gefreut habe
‘Your letter from your holidays, about which I was happy’

According to DWDS (Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache) Umlaut (mask., -s, -es, -e) is the diacritic mark (¨) placed over a vowel to indicate a change in its sound.
Finally, when prepositional relativisers have an animate antecedent, the following patterns are possible: *preposition + pronoun (mit dem, in der...), was* and interrogative pronouns such as *alles, nichts, viel or wenig*.

**Part II Empirical Analysis**

**3. Aims and methodology**

This study resorts to a corpus-based methodology in order to assess the similarities and differences that emerge when comparing and contrasting English *wh*-relatives with human antecedents and prepositional markers (*who, whom; preposition + relativisers which and whom*) with their Spanish (*que, quien; oblique relatives*) and German (*der, die, das; dual prepositions*) equivalents. Details on the structure of the corpora are provided in section 3.1., which is followed by the presentation of the research questions that will be pursued (section 3.2.) and relevant information concerning the extraction of the data and their analysis (section 3.3.)

**3.1. Description of the corpora**

As already mentioned in the introduction, this study is based on the analysis of the *Simon Fraser University Review Corpus* (SFURC), which consists of 400 online written reviews. For my analysis I have chosen 150 texts evaluating movies in English, Spanish and German, half of them being positive reviews (labeled with the tag of ‘recommended’) and the other half being negative (with the tag of ‘not recommended’). In addition, some of these reviews are also defined as positive or negative reviews based on the number of stars given by the reviewer (1-2= negative, 4-5= positive, whereas 3-star reviews are not included), as shown in Table 13. As Epinions, which is the electronic platform that allowed people to evaluate the different films with which this corpus deals, is a public device, the written style is considered as informal. The movies under review are shown in Tables 14 to 16.

The SFURC was chosen not only because it reported a wide range of relative pronouns, but also because it allowed us to overcome the problem of finding a comparable corpus
that allowed us to contrast the three languages under analysis, given the scarcity of such corpora. However, it should be noted the scrutinised reviews are not equal in length. For instance, there are some texts with a length of four or five lines (En yes16.txt; Sp no_1_1.txt), while others are five pages long (Gm ja_7_5.txt; Gm ja_20_5.txt). Likewise, the distribution of relative pronouns is also uneven: in some texts no instances of wh-relative pronouns were found (En yes14.txt; En no20.txt) while others have many tokens (En no1.txt; En yes10.txt; En yes23.txt). In order to circumvent the problems derived from comparing texts of different lengths normalized frequencies will be provided (Biber et al., 1999:263).

Table 13. Size and structure of SFURC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Subtype</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Text code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English (movies)</td>
<td>Positive Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>yes1.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes25.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no1.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no25.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish (películas)</td>
<td>Positive Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>yes_5_1.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes_4_25.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no_1 txt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no_2_25.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (Filme)</td>
<td>Positive Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ja_1_5.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ja_25_5.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>nein_1_1.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nein_25_2.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of texts</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Movies belonging to the English Review Corpus


---

5 As already noted, The Simon Fraser University Review Corpus (SFURC), is comprised of 400 written texts. However, the structure present in the previous table corresponds with the 150 texts specifically selected for the empirical analysis of this paper.
Table 15. Movies belonging to the Spanish Review Corpus


Table 16. Movies belonging to the German Review Corpus


3.2. Research questions

The empirical analysis carried out in this investigation seeks to provide answers for the nine following questions:

RQ 1: In which language does the relative pronoun who and their Spanish (que, quien) and German (der, die, das) equivalents?
RQ 2: Which Spanish equivalent of who appears more frequently?
RQ 3: Which equivalent of who appears more frequently in German?
RQ 4: Focusing on the opposition between who-relatives and that-relatives, which of the two is the most frequent in the SFURC?
RQ 5: Do the three languages under analysis present the same frequency of use of the accusative form (whom) and their Spanish (que, quien, (el) que and its variants) and German (den, die, das) equivalents?
RQ 6: How often do prepositions appear with relativisers (which and whom)?
RQ 7: Which is the most repeated preposition in each of the languages under analysis?
RQ 8: In which respects do who-relatives with fronted and stranded prepositions differ?
RQ 9: Are the relativisers under scrutiny more frequent in restrictive or in non-restrictive constructions according to the SFURC?

3.3. Data extraction and analysis

Firstly, the data were automatically retrieved using AntConc. The number of tokens obtained was 131 who relative pronouns for English, 2367 for Spanish (2344 que and 23 quien) and 2853 for German (1033 der, 1283 die and 537 das), which amount to 5351 in the three languages. Then, the tokens were manually examined to be able to determine which of these tokens were really relative pronouns, and not conjunctions or interrogative pronouns, as it occurs in (121), (122) and (123). Furthermore, there were other cases in which the relative pronoun could not be included in the analysis because it possessed a non-human antecedent. Consequently, this type of relativisers could not be counterparts of who, as exemplified in (124) and (125).

(121) **Who** is this guy Bo Welch and why did Brian Grazer allow him to direct a multi-bazillion dollar movie? <SFURC: En no9.txt>

(122) Me cuentan que es carísima, que la destrucción del puente de Brooklyn es la escena más cara de la historia <SFURC: Sp no_2_10.txt>
‘They tell me that it is very expensive, that the destruction of Brooklyn’s bridge is the most expensive scene in history’

(123) Jeff Bridges, der Hauptdarsteller des ersten Filmes, spielt auch hier die Rolle des Kevin Flynn. <SFURC: Gm ja_3_5>
‘Jeff Bridges, the main character of the first film, here also plays the role of Kevin Flynn’

(124) Un robot que se dedica a supuestamente reciclar <SFURC: Sp no_1_1.txt>
‘A robot which is supposedly devoted to recycling’
Ein Raumfahrt-Konsortium, das nach wertvollen Ressourcen sucht [...] <SFURC: Gm ja_11_5.txt>

‘A space consortium which looks for valuable resources’

In (121) who is not a relative pronoun, but an interrogative pronoun functioning as subject within an interrogative clause. In (122) que is a subordinating conjunction introducing a complement clause. In (123) der plays the role of definite article. Finally, despite the fact that in examples (124) and (125) que and das function as relativisers, they are not counterparts of who, but of which because their antecedents are not human.

The number of exclusions was extremely low in the case of English, in which 3 tokens were discarded. In the cases of Spanish and German, more exclusions were necessary among other reasons because in these two languages the markers under scrutiny may perform functions other than relativiser (-interrogative/exclamative pronouns, or even as definite articles). As a result, it was necessary to scrutinize each example in its context to be able to determine whether or not it was a relative construction.

A database was also created in order to characterize the instances of wh-relatives found in SFURC. Table 17 lists the four variables that were selected on the basis of the nine research questions proposed in section 3.2. A discussion of the results that were obtained is offered in turn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17. Variables taken into consideration for the analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition+ relativizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of relative clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of preposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Discussion of findings

4.1. Normalised frequencies of who

Considering RQ 1, Table 18 shows that 532 tokens of wh-relatives were found in the SFURC, of which 128 correspond to English who relative pronoun, 251 to Spanish que/quien relative pronouns and 153 to German der/die/das relative pronouns. Since the number of tokens differs from one language to another, it becomes necessary to provide the relative frequencies of these constructions in each language. Figure 1 provides the relative frequencies of English who relative pronoun and their Spanish and German equivalents per 10,000 words (henceforth pttw). Our findings describe Spanish relative pronouns que/quien as more frequent in the 50 texts written in informal style than their English and German counterparts, giving an answer to the first research question posed, which confirms the claims made in previous studies such as Biber et al (1999:263). The frequencies between English and German are more similar, although English who relative pronoun is found to be more recurrent than its German equivalents.

Table 18. Absolute frequency of who and their Spanish and German counterparts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td>que</td>
<td>quien</td>
<td>der</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automatically retrieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included in the analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.33%</td>
<td>47.16%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>16.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the number of tokens and the size of texts differ from one language to another, it is necessary to provide the relative frequencies of these constructions in each language. Figure 1 provides normalized frequencies per 10,000 words (henceforth pttw) of who.
and their Spanish and German equivalents. Our findings show that German variants are the least frequent relativisers (32.03%), whereas the frequencies for its English and Spanish equivalents are more balanced, although que/quien, which represent 47.54%, are more frequent than who (38.33%).

Figure 1. Normalised frequencies of who relative pronoun and their Spanish and German equivalents (per text)

---

Now regarding RQ 2 and 3, our results suggest that que, which represents 47.16%, is the most frequent relativiser in the case of Spanish in opposition with quien, which has been revealed as almost inexistent (0.38%). Dealing with RQ 3, we observe that der is the most recurrent variant in German (16.96%), followed by feminine (die) and neuter (das) variants, representing 13.61% and 1.46%, respectively.

Further details on the Spanish and German relativisers are offered in sections 4.2. and 4.3. below, respectively, while corresponding sections are devoted to treat who vs. that as relative markers (section 4.4.) and whom and its Spanish and German equivalents section 4.5.) in order to provide an answer for RQs 4 and 5, respectively. Sections 4.6.
and 4.7. focus on RQs 6 to 8 revolving around prepositional relatives in the three languages, while section 4.8. targets RQ 9 on the type of syntactic construction that *wh*-relatives tend to participate in, restrictive or non-restrictive, according to our data.

### 4.2. Spanish relative *que* versus Spanish relative *quien*

Table 19 displays the absolute and normalized frequencies of Spanish *que* and *quien* relative pronouns, their number of tokens automatically retrieved, the frequency of tokens that have been discarded for the analysis and the frequency of those taken into consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Que</th>
<th>Quien</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens retrieved</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens excluded</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens included for the analysis</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.16%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As observed from (Tables 18 and 19), in Spanish there is an overwhelming tendency to use *que* (249 instances, representing 47.16%), in contrast with only two instances of *quien* in the Spanish subcomponent of the SFURC which are reproduced below:

(126) Quizás es la ironía de que Juno, *quien* supuestamente debería ser la adolescente irresponsable, sea finalmente una tía supermadura, incluso más que el futuro aspirante a padre <SFURC: Sp no_2_13.txt>

‘Maybe it is the irony that Juno, *who* should be apparently the irresponsible *teenager*, is in the end a very mature chick, even more than the future candidate for father’

(127) Hannibal (*quien* ejerce de pinche de cocina) se entretiene unos segundos para recoger las placas de identificación de todos ellos <SFURC: Sp yes_4_18.txt>
Hannibal, who works as kitchen helper, pauses for a while in order to pick up the dog-tags of them all

4.3. German relative pronouns der, die or das

As already noted, in German there are three different relative pronouns in the nominative case which can function as equivalents of English who: der is masculine, die refers to feminine entities, whereas das is neuter. Table 20 represents the absolute frequency of each German variant.

Table 20. Frequency of German: der, die, das

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Der</th>
<th>Die</th>
<th>Das</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automatically retrieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens excluded</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens included</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.96%</td>
<td>13.61%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 above suggests that the most frequent German equivalent of who is the masculine relative pronoun der, with 81 tokens (representing 16.96%). In contrast, the feminine variant die (65 tokens) is less frequent and the neuter das is the least frequent of the three probably because it seldom refers to human entities. Neuter nouns such as das Kind (boy) or das Mädchen (girl) are the only neuter nouns in German which refer to human entities, as it occurs in (128).

(128) Gulliver als Püppchen eines Kindes, das ihn als quasi läutert <SFURC: Gm nein_9_2.txt>

‘Gulliver as the baby doll of a kid, who almost looks after him’
4.4. *Who* versus *that* as relative markers

Although the initial intention was to explore *wh*-relative clauses, we may consider appropriate to make a comparison between *who* (marker of *wh*-relatives with which this study is concerned) and *that*, which, in fact, is the most employed relative marker in everyday English. Despite the fact that *that*-clauses are considered the most ordinary type of relatives, the English subcomponent under inspection shows that there is a general preference for *wh*-relatives rather than for *that*-relatives. Table 21 displays the absolute frequency of each relative marker, in which English favours *who*-relative clauses (38.33%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21. Absolute frequency of <em>who</em> versus <em>that</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens automatically retrieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tokens included in the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5. *Whom* and their Spanish and German equivalents

Although one of the original intentions of this paper was to explore *whom* due to its differences in terms of case once compared with the rest of relative pronouns under analysis, it is in the empirical analysis where we must realize that our initial purpose cannot be achieved because of its scarce presence within the corpora. In fact, there is only one sentence in which *whom* appears, exemplified in (129).

Nevertheless, although examples of clauses headed by *whom* functioning as the accusative form of *who* could not have been taken into consideration, we must
emphasize its frequent repetitions within the corpus after prepositions, which will be later discussed in sections 4.7 and 4.8.

(129) The story is non-existent and *Michael Myers* (whom I usually enjoy) compresses every character he’s ever played into one big hairy annoying one.

4.6. Absolute frequency of prepositions

As already noted in the introduction, an additional chapter has been dedicated to the study of prepositional relatives. Due to a personal interest in this type of constructions, both tables 22 to 24 and figures 2 to 4 below will provide a list with the most frequent prepositions appearing in each of the three languages under analysis.

In order to give an answer to the sixth research question, only 5 prepositions (the most repeated ones) have been selected for each of the three languages, whose total number of prepositions is 157. As it can be seen below the most recurrent relative prepositions are *with* corresponding to English (6 cases), *en* corresponding to Spanish (38) and *in* corresponding to German (11 cases).

**Table 22. English prepositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>Prepositions</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. English prepositions

Table 23. Spanish prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>Prepositions</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARA</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Spanish prepositions
Taking prepositional relatives into consideration, we must underline a specific characteristic, which is found to be frequent in the three languages under analysis. This characteristic consists of the repetition of prepositional relatives with *which*.

However, when focusing on human antecedents, English, Spanish and German barely present prepositional clauses headed by the accusative form, which is *whom*. In conclusion, the three languages studied in this paper show general preference for prepositional relatives with non-human antecedents, as in (130-135). On the other hand,
they are characterized by a scarce presence of those relatives formed by *whom*. Some of the few cases concerning *whom* are also provided below.

(130) But *her students*, four of *whom* we focus on in particular, have their own stories <SFURC: En no2.txt> [preposition + whom]

(131) Sao Feng (Chow Yun-Fat) es *el inteligente pirata de Singapur de dos caras para el que* no existen ni el bien y ni el mal en el mundo de los piratas <SFURC: Sp yes_4_21.txt> [preposition + whom]
‘Sao Feng (Chow Yun-Fat) is *the intelligent pirate from Singapur with two faces to whom* good and evil do not exist in the pirates’ world’

(132) Darren Aronofsky ist sicherlich *ein Regisseur*, an dem sich die Geister scheiden. <SFURC: Gm ja_15_5.txt> [preposition + whom]
‘Darren Aronofsky is surely *a film director over/about whom* ghosts diverge’

(133) Julia Stiles does get *a great speech* in toward the end *in which* she basically play the kettle calling the pot black in return. <SFURC: En no2.txt> [preposition + which]

(134) *su frescura y su ironia bajo la cual* esconde todos sus miedos y dudas <SFURC: Sp yes_5_13.txt> [preposition + which]
‘His freshness and *his irony, under which* he hides all his fears and hesitations’

(135) *Eine emotionale dramatische Geschichte unter der man mitleidet* <SFURC: Gm ja_2_4> [preposition + which]
‘*An emotional and dramatic story from which* people suffer’

4.8. Type of prepositions: fronted versus stranded

As previously mentioned in section 4.5., we must differentiate two types of sequences. As discussed in Part I, when relative pronouns are accompanied by prepositions, two different phenomena can take place/occur: preposition stranding and preposition...
fronting. Focusing on the examples analysed, the data show that the vast majority of sequences with prepositional relatives present fronted prepositions, that is to say, that their prepositions are placed before relativisers which or whom, as exemplified in (136).

(136) but the very ordinariness of many of the other women, and the art with which they are presented in the calendar is a refreshing reminder that beauty can be more than we see in Cosmopolitan and Access Hollywood. <SFU RC: En yes2.txt>

As the vast majority of examples under analysis presented sequences headed by fronted prepositions, it can be argued that this is due to the fact that preposition stranding is more frequent in spoken registers rather than in written style. Consequently, the number of cases where preposition stranding occurs is dramatically reduced, being only three cases highlighted within the English Review Corpus, where clauses are headed by whom (examples 137 and 138) or characterized by the absence of relative marker (as in 139) and prepositions are placed at the end of the clause.

(137) as Giselle continues to flirt with Dunbar, whom she had an affair with in the summer. <SFURC: En no1.txt>

(138) Sometimes, the problem with writing a review is just knowing whom you’re writing it for. <SFURC: En yes15.txt>

(139) After having heard so many positive reviews of the movie Elf, including a recommendation by one of the people I work with <SFURC: En yes10.txt>

4.9. Restrictive versus non-restrictive relative clauses

Regarding the conceptual framework illustrated in Part I, and specifically, the different classes to which relative clauses could belong, there is a classification in terms of syntax, where two different types of relatives are distinguished: restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses (already explained in section 1.1.).
As observed from the following figure, restrictive clauses play a major role in this study, because 115 examples out of 131 consist of relative clauses in which the antecedent is identified. Thus, the remaining 26 examples would be non-restrictive clauses, in which further information about the antecedent is given.

Figure 5. Restrictive versus non-restrictive relative clauses

Conclusions and suggestions for further research

This study has not aimed to be exhaustive, nor could it be, given the number of languages under analysis and the complexity of the structures studied. Thus, due to the great deal of information found we were forced to delimit our research, focusing on the analysis of a specific relative pronoun (who). However, we hope to have shed some new light on the use of wh-relative clauses from a corpus-based cross-linguistic perspective.

First, as already mentioned in the introduction, we have examined three different languages in order to compare wh-relative clauses in English, Spanish and German and thus, see the parallelisms and divergences emerging from this contrast. Despite having a common source, which is the Indo-European, these languages belong to different families: both English and German are Germanic languages, whereas Spanish is considered a Romance language. Thus, as a consequence of having the same origin, they share some grammatical aspects from a morphological and a lexical point of view. Being both of them Germanic languages, consequently, parallelisms between English and German can be found, for instance in the organization of clauses, the position of
relativisers, etc. Moreover, despite being two languages that do not belong to the same family, this study has demonstrated that parallelisms between Spanish and German are much more frequent rather than between English and German. This is due to the fact that although Spanish lost its grammatical cases, it incorporated a wide range of prepositional structures instead, being at the same level of German, which actually maintains all the cases inherited from Indo-European and its prepositional structures.

Second, we have observed multiple equivalents of English relative pronoun who in both Spanish and German languages. Whereas English only possesses a unique and invariable form for the relative pronoun which is governed by nominative and makes reference to human antecedents, in the other languages under analysis we can find two different equivalents in the case of Spanish or even three in the case of German.

Third, we have analysed in more depth the accusative form of who, which is whom. In contrast with our initial thinking, our corpus-based analysis has revealed that there are few cases in which relative clauses are headed by the accusative form. Actually, structures marked by who or a gap appears to be much more frequent.

Fourth, we have discussed prepositional relative clauses as we consider it an underexplored topic within the relative clauses. Our corpus-based analysis has shown the extremely high frequency of prepositions + relativisers in the three languages, but particularly in Spanish and German, possibly due to a major/greater maintenance of case inflections of the original language (Indo-European).

Fifth, our research, as the corresponding figures reveal, shows that wh-relative clauses are more recurrent in restrictive clauses, rather than in non-restrictive clauses.

In concluding this study, it is evident that there are still many gaps worth analyzing regarding wh-relative clauses and further investigations need to be accomplished in order to examine this topic in more detail, analysing the relationship of other types of English relativisers such as which, whose or where, with their Spanish and German counterparts. In addition, it would be stimulating to extend the analysis to spoken registers, comparing the parallelisms and divergences between written and spoken
language, and to other types of informal written texts different from those studied (film reviews), not to mention/without forgetting other texts considered as more formal, such as literary texts. In addition, prepositional structures, still partly-studied, also deserve to be analyzed in further detail focusing on examples headed by *which*, which our study has revealed to be the most frequent. The previous suggestions will contribute to create a more realistic vision of the actual performance of *wh*-relative clauses in the three languages under study, enabling us to observe not only the possible coincidences among them, but also (the) particular characteristics.
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### Appendix I: Spanish relative pronouns. Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th>ANTECEDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(el) que</td>
<td>(la) que</td>
<td>(los) que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(el) cual</td>
<td>(la) cual</td>
<td>(los) cuales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quien</td>
<td>quien</td>
<td>quienes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix II: Criteria when choosing relativisers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of clause</th>
<th>Restrictive</th>
<th>Non-restrictive</th>
<th>Escindidas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Register</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal and Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal antecedent</td>
<td>Preposition + article + que</td>
<td>Preposition quien/quienes Preposition los/las cuales Preposition cuyo/a/os/as Preposition + article + que (Object)</td>
<td>Preposition + article + que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Que (Subject)</td>
<td>Que-Quien El/La cual Los cuales/ las cuales A + article + que (Object) A + quien (Direct Object)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-personal antecedent</th>
<th>Preposition + Article + que</th>
<th>Preposition + los/las cuales</th>
<th>Preposition + cuyo/a/os/as</th>
<th>El/La cual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preposition + que</td>
<td>Que (subject)</td>
<td>Los cuales/las cuales (Subject)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preposition + los/las cuales</td>
<td>Que (Direct Object)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preposition + cuyo/a/os/as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-explicit antecedent</td>
<td>Article + que</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial element</td>
<td>Donde—En donde</td>
<td>En el /La cual</td>
<td>Donde—En donde</td>
<td>Donde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(location)</td>
<td>En + Article + que</td>
<td>En los/las cuales</td>
<td>En + article + que</td>
<td>Article + que</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: First variety versus second variety of pronouns in German

**German definite pronouns: der, die, das**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kasus</th>
<th>Maskulin</th>
<th>Feminin</th>
<th>Neutrum</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominativ</td>
<td>der</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>das</td>
<td>die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkusativ</td>
<td>den</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>das</td>
<td>die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dativ</td>
<td>dem</td>
<td>der</td>
<td>dem</td>
<td>den</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitiv</td>
<td>dessen</td>
<td>deren</td>
<td>dessen</td>
<td>deren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**German indefinite pronouns: welcher, welche, welches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kasus</th>
<th>Maskulin</th>
<th>Feminin</th>
<th>Neutrum</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominativ</td>
<td>welcher</td>
<td>Welche</td>
<td>welches</td>
<td>welche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkusativ</td>
<td>welchen</td>
<td>Welche</td>
<td>welches</td>
<td>welche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dativ</td>
<td>welchem</td>
<td>Welcher</td>
<td>welchem</td>
<td>welchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitiv</td>
<td>welches</td>
<td>Welcher</td>
<td>welches</td>
<td>welcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix IV: Comparison among the three languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFLECTIONS</strong></td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accusative <em>whom</em></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREP + RELATIVIZER</strong></td>
<td>PREP + <em>which</em></td>
<td>PREP + CUAL</td>
<td>Multiple variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PREP + <em>whom</em></td>
<td>PREP + QUE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHENOMENA</strong></td>
<td>Preposition stranding</td>
<td>Omission of the article</td>
<td>Pronominal adverbs: <em>wo</em> and <em>da</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>